

Remarks of Mr. Rives, On the amendment, proposed by Mr. Clay, to the Bank Bill, on the 27th July, 1841.

MR. RIVES said it would be a matter of sincere satisfaction to him, if he could find it at all practicable, consistently with the principles he had invariably held and frankly avowed on this floor, to assent to the proposition made by the Senator from Kentucky.

The honorable Senator has told us that this proposition has been offered in a spirit of compromise and conciliation. I do all honor, said Mr. R., to that spirit on every occasion, and particularly when manifested by the Senator from Kentucky. But I think he must perceive, that in regard to those who stand in the position, in which I stand in reference to this question, there is nothing of compromise, nothing of concession in this amendment. What was the principle avowed in the project of the Secretary of the Treasury, which he, Mr. R., submitted to the Senate as an amendment to the bill reported by the Senator? It was the absolute and unqualified assent of the States, as a condition precedent to the establishment of branches within the limits of any State. While this proposition, on its face, seems to recognize this principle, it afterwards completely obliterates it. He knew that the honorable Senator, and those who co-operate with him, are incapable of intentionally "paltering in a double sense;" but I ask him if this proposition does not, while it seems to "keep the promise to the ear, break it to the hope." It seems, with providing that branches of this corporation shall be established in the States, with the assent of the States; but this is immediately followed up with two qualifications which utterly annihilate and blot out the principle. The first of these qualifications is, that these sovereign States, which, in the exercise of their sovereignty, are to decide whether they will or will not admit branches of this corporation, are to be held down to a particular period, within three or four months after the arrangements are commenced for the organization of this institution, to assent or dissent, and if they do not *unconditionally* assent or dissent, at the first meeting of the Legislature after the passage of this act, (a thing which may be physically and morally impossible, if the two branches of the Legislature happen to differ in opinion,) then in the very teeth of this non-assent, their assent is to be arbitrarily presumed!

The fundamental principle of those who objected, on constitutional grounds, to the original form of the bill, is that the concurrence of the wills of both the State sovereignties and of the General Government, was necessary to the extension of this institution beyond the limits of the District of Columbia; and can you say you are to presume a tacit concurrence against sovereign States—in the teeth of the positive proof which they may present at the next ensuing session of their Legislature of their dissent; and by the bill, you are to hold them irrevocably bound for the remaining period of the charter. I respectfully submit to the honorable Senator from Kentucky, and my honorable and patriotic friends co-operating with him, whether it is consistent with the respect due to any sovereignty, to say to it, "I give you some three or four months to say whether you will have a branch or not; and if you do not or cannot decide within that space, we will hold you perpetually bound, notwithstanding your dissent, which may be subsequently known."

The honorable Senator from Kentucky must see that gentlemen who have constitutional objections to the original form of his bill, and who stand on the ground I have occupied in this matter, can find nothing to remove their objections to the proposition he has brought forward. There is nothing whatever in it that in the slightest degree obviates the difficulty with one who believes that a branch of this institution cannot be introduced within the limits of the States without their previous assent—a provision distinctly made by the project of the Secretary of the Treasury.

But the honorable Senator has told us, also, that there is a concession on his part, and that of my honorable friends who co-operate with him, in bringing forward this proposition, to this extent—that they allow that the positive dissent of the States, if declared at the first session of their Legislatures after the passage of this act, shall prevent the establishment of the branches. But even that concession is not granted for a subsequent proviso expressly declares, that though a State should positively dissent, yet if Congress, in the exercise of its judgment, shall believe it necessary and proper to establish a branch, they may come forward, and by virtue of their sovereign authority, (as the honorable Senator calls it) override the decision of the States. Certainly the Senator from Kentucky will see, that is the consequence—the intended consequence of the provisions of this amendment. We all know very well that it is the opinion, at this moment, of the friends of a National Bank in both Houses of Congress, that the establishment of offices of discount and deposit in the States is already so "necessary and proper" that Congress might provide for them forthwith, without the assent of the States. The plain English of this proposition, then, is that the States may declare their dissent; yet their dissent, when declared, shall be overridden and trodden under foot, by the sovereign fiat of the Congress of the United States!

I am sure the honorable Senator and myself do not differ about the import, in one sense at least, of the language so often quoted from the Constitution—"necessary and proper." He does not believe that it is an occasional, momentary, fluctuating necessity that may be supposed to exist to-day, but ceases to-morrow, which can make a measure constitutional. I know that the enlightened understanding of that honorable Senator would reject such an interpretation, which would make the Constitution one thing to-day, another to-morrow. The sort of necessity which the Constitution recognizes as the standard of

"necessary and proper" measures, (unlike that necessity which is "the tyrant's plea," must be a necessity existing in the general and permanent relation of things. I think I may answer for the Senator from Kentucky that that is his view, as well as mine. He will excuse me, then, for declining to give my sanction to any proposition which would seem to refer the powers of the Constitution to a different, and perpetually fluctuating standard.

Then the result is this. I announce it with sincere regret. I cannot vote for the proposition of the honorable Senator from Kentucky, as a compromise, because it is, in my humble judgment, entirely delusive; and while it proposes to concede, its only effect is to mystify and embarrass, and finally to assert the obnoxious power in the most offensive form. I think the honorable Senator, and my friends generally, must see, that if I mean to act out, as a man, the principles I have avowed on this floor, I cannot concur in such a proposition.

(Here Mr. Clay shook his head.) The honorable Senator from Kentucky (continued Mr. Rives) indicates his dissent by a shake of the head. It is sufficient for me that the dictates of my own breast present it in this light. It does seem to me in this light. It does seem to me, doing all honor to the motives of the distinguished Senator, that his conciliatory proposition is like another celebrated conciliatory proposition—that of Lord North, in the time of the Revolution. While the Colonies were contending against the asserted right of the British Parliament to tax them, without their consent, the prime minister, in the crisis of the contest, designed to make them a conciliatory proposition to this effect: "We will permit you to tax yourselves, if you will do it in the manner and to the extent which we require; but if not, we will continue to tax you of our own authority." What is the import of the proposition now before us? We will permit the States to declare their assent to the establishment of branches within their limits; but if they do not assent, believing it to be necessary and proper we will establish them without their assent, and even in spite of their dissent. The conciliatory proposition of Lord North was unanimously rejected by the Colonies, and the honorable Senator will pardon me for saying that, in my judgment, there is as little of concession in his, according to those old-fashioned views of the limitations of the Constitution and the rights of the States which it is my misfortune to entertain.

While I do not concur with the honorable Senator in the earnest conviction he has so frequently expressed that a bank of the United States is the *panacea* for all the evils under which the country labors, I yet do concur with him with my whole soul, in the desire to see this disturbing question settled, finally and harmoniously settled—and would lend my heart and hand, to any settlement of it, which I believed to be consistent with the rightful sovereignty of the States and the principles of our federative compact. I have already manifested my willingness to go with him in accepting the project of the Secretary of the Treasury, referring to the free and unqualified assent of the States to the establishment, within their borders, of branches of the Fiscal Institution to be created here. And why should not this be done? Why not? Has not the honorable Senator told us this day, that he was firmly convinced that a large majority of the States (which would be fully as many as it would be desirable to have branches in) would give their assent? Why not then put it on this ground? Why make needless issues with those who might otherwise co-operate with him, when, according to his assertion this day, every practical end might be obtained, by referring the matter to the free and unshackled assent of the States.

I am sorry, said Mr. Rives, to have been under the necessity of occupying the attention of the Senate with the expression of these views; but when a proposition is submitted in the name of a compromise, which, in my opinion, concedes nothing to the convictions of those who stand in the position I occupy, I have thought it due alike to my friends here and to myself, to state to them frankly the considerations which render it impossible for me, at least, to become a party to it, without a surrender of principles which I have ever held sacred and fundamental.

PUBLIC FAITH—BANK—REPUBLICANISM.

We were struck with the earnestness and eloquence with which Mr. Clay, of Ky., a few days since, vindicated the public faith against the vandal spirit of Loco-Focoism; and, referring to the speech made in the Senate by Mr. Tyler, in 1834, against the removal of the deposits from the United States Bank, we were also reminded that the public faith found a sincere friend in him. Alluding to the consequences of the act of the Secretary of the Treasury, in removing the deposits, Mr. Tyler said:

"Has he given greater stability to public credit? That can only be done by a rigid adherence to public faith. If a man violates a contract, into which he has entered for a valuable consideration, all confidence is lost in him by the public; so it is with Governments, in a more especial manner. PUBLIC FAITH is the very breath of their nostrils; public credit rests on public faith, and confidence in the fidelity in which a Government fulfills its contracts, is the life-blood that nourishes and sustains its credit. Sir, that confidence is as sensitive as the spider in his web to every passing gale; the breath of suspicion agitates it, and the hand of violence destroys it."

In another part of this speech, Mr. Tyler, thus alluded to the necessity of settling the Bank controversy in one way or the other.

"This contest has continued long enough; its agitation has never failed to produce disastrous results; whatever affects the currency affects every interest of society. Why shall this dispute be periodically continued? let it be settled in one way or the other by the States; and settled permanently. The question of bank or no bank has been always made a political stepping stone—ambition seeks to vault into the Presidential saddle through its influence. Sir, it is the last

subject which ought to be handed over to politicians; there is too much of distress produced by its agitation; the interests of the country are too nearly connected with the currency to be eternally made the subject of political speculations."

Mr. TYLER also defined the party to which he belonged in the following manner:

"We are continually told of the necessity of preserving the republican party. Such, sir, has been my constant effort since I have been in public life. I regard its preservation as connected with the preservation of the Union and of liberty. To its principles I have continued to cling with all my soul and with all my strength. But I will tell the Senate and the country to what republican party I do belong—to that which brought Mr. Jefferson into power—which rests upon the federal principle—which rebukes every assumption of authority not warranted by the Constitution—which proclaims the inviolability of law, and the strict observance of public faith. To this party I do belong, not to that non-descript, patch-work, mosaic party, which meets in conventions, and calls itself the republican party. Not to that party which changes its principles as the chameleon its color, with every cloud or ray which proceeds from the Presidential orb—which is one thing to-day, another to-morrow, and the third day whatever changes may make it—nor to the republican party which plays off names against men, calling one the father of the American system, for the purpose of affecting him in a particular quarter, and yet goes in advance of him upon that very system—denounces the tariff, and yet votes for and sustains the tariff of 1823; that bill of abominations—not the republican party which denounces the bank and upholds the proclamation—which denounces the bank and sustains the force bill—which denounces the bank, and even now sustains the President in his assumption of power conferred neither by the laws or Constitution. No, sir, I belong not to that 'republican party,' its work is that of President-making. Even now it is in motion. Before the President is scarcely warm in his seat—not yielding to what decency would seem to require—not even permitting one short year to elapse, that party is in full march—calling conventions, organizing committees, and seeking by all manner of means, at this early day, to commit the people. But I will tell them, Mr. President, in the language of holy writ, that 'the race is not to the swift.' They are too much in advance of that question. The people will demand some short breathing time, and when the proper time arrives for them to act, I trust, sir, that they will look only to high considerations in selecting an agent to fill the highest office in the world, because conferred by a free and enlightened people. I hope they will select the individual most capable of advancing the public good; whether he be the favorite of this or that man who may be high in office. With that business I have nothing to do, I hope the country will have nothing to do with it, until the vital questions which now engage us shall be settled on a proper basis. So we hope now."

There was a remarkable consistency in Mr. Tyler's course in Congress, indicating that he was always actuated by the profoundest convictions of principle, moral and political.—*Madisonian*.

From the Madisonian, August 3. GOOD DEMOCRATIC DOCTRINE.

The Democratic Review, in addressing the President of the United States, uses the following manly language, and "thus faithfully," the Boston Post says, "expresses the sentiments of the Democratic party." It is totally at variance with the spirit of the Globe, which whines over every removal however insignificant or however just:

"We care not for your offices—we want none of your patronage. Bestow all that you have to bestow on those who have been languishing for the space of three Presidential terms, afar from the smiles of Executive favor, in the chilly regions of opposition. Let them be but honest and honorable men, and we care not who may be the incumbents of the public appointments in your gift. We would encourage, too, rather than deprecate the most searching scrutiny which any suspicions may desire, into any of the details of executive administration throughout the whole extent of its widely extended action. Whatever abuses may have existed, if any, naturally incident to a prolonged possession of executive office, let them be fully explored by the jealous vigilance of new incumbents. Whatever useful reforms may be suggested from any quarter, let them be frankly met and gladly adopted. Every such denunciation of an abuse, every such suggestion of a reform, is a common public benefit; and no party has an equal interest in the purity of administration with that of the Democracy. Let the new brooms sweep as clean as they can. This has always been one of the chief subjects of clamor by the opposition against the two late administrations; and in the same spirit in which, when supporting those administrations, we denied the general truth of those violent and random charges, we are perfectly willing now, ourselves in opposition, if it be but fairly and honorably conducted, to court the widest latitude of investigation into them all. Reduce the action of the executive branch as much as you choose—purify it, if you can. In every step you may take in such a direction, if you can find any to take, I will answer for it that the democracy of the country will go with you heart and hand."

The following is a description given by the Boston Courier of a Loco-foco out of office:

ANOTHER HEAD OFF.—"This cry with 'guillotine,' 'keep the axe going,' &c. continues to be repeated by the opposition papers at every removal of one of their party from office. This is nothing less than an open confession that a Loco-foco without an office is a creature without a head—good for nothing at all. That he possesses, intrinsically, neither eyes nor ears, sense, perception, nor understanding; but owes every thing to the 'appointing power,' that his intellect lies in his fees, and he is never sure of the possession of brains till he sees his quarterly salary. When these people learn that the public 'have no further occasion for their services,' they are chopped off from all communion with the living and breathing world, become dead men straightway, and stalk the earth with their heads under their arms. This is no very flattering picture to the Loco-foco party, but as they have drawn it themselves, we do not see how they can complain that we have 'glanced and framed it.'"

The Steam-boat Missouri has been burnt, while repairing at St. Louis, and the Caroline has been snagged, by which the hull was lost.

The President of the Gallipolis (Ohio) Bank has been sentenced to fourteen years imprisonment in the Ohio Penitentiary.

THE TIMES.



FAYETTE.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 21, 1841.

MR. WEBSTER'S LETTERS.

While the community is filled with suspense in reference to the fate of the Bank Bill with the President (should it pass the House in its present shape) we have deemed it but just to the administration that the People and the country should see its TRUE POSITION, from the commencement, in relation to this great question. This is very properly and fairly disclosed in the letters of the 16th and 17th ultimo, which, as has subsequently transpired, were written by the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to Col. KETCHUM, (a friend in New York) and by him handed for publication in the Commercial Advertiser of that city. We need scarcely say that they have wrought a profound conviction, every where, of the sincere desire of President TYLER, to go the full length permitted by his constitutional opinions, in favor of the restoration of a sound, safe and uniform currency; and we apprehend but few will rise from their personal uncandid enough to pretend that the bill from the Treasury (identical with Mr. Rives' amendment, as to the branching power) would not have answered every national purpose as well or better than the one over which the Senate and the House have been so long disputing, and which may end, not in a better bill, but NO LAW AT ALL!

In connexion with these letters, we hope the reader will not rise from his seat before he has also perused two articles from the Baltimore Patriot—one editorial and the other communicated. The latter, in shewing up the profound incapacity of Messrs. "Alexander Brown & Sons," and the other Baltimore merchants who undertook to advise Senator MERRICK, upon a subject which it seems they had not properly examined themselves, will not be lost, we hope, upon such gentlemen in this country as have decided the whole bank question a hundred times within the last six weeks without ever having read the bill of Mr. EWING, or reflected even upon that distinguishing portion of it which was embraced in the amendment of Mr. Rives.

If men would read more and talk less they would not half so much expose themselves as many do, every day, on this same bank question; and this remark is as applicable to the denunciations we have heard against Mr. Webster, for the sudden change so falsely imputed to him, as to the general subject. Read the editorial from the Patriot—take it in connexion with his letters to Ketchum (already referred to)—in short, take all the articles on our first page together, READ THEM ALL—and if the bank bill is finally lost—or if, after passing both houses and being vetoed by the President, Congress at last set themselves about the common sense business of passing a bill which may *certainly* become a law and which will answer all legitimate purposes—if these things shall happen, all we desire to say at present is, that neither President TYLER nor his cabinet will be answerable for the unnecessary consumption of the public time, for they have been ready, from the commencement, to co-operate with Congress in the passage of such a bill as they were called upon for by a resolution of the Senate. Let it not be objected, either, that this would be dictating to Congress, for Henry Clay himself was the author of the resolution—the father of the call! Lastly, let it be borne in mind, that of all that bill of Mr. Ewing, the administration has yielded all already for the sake of "compromise," except the power to locate branches without the assent of the States—and with all this before the mind of the country, let each actor in the scene bear his just proportion of praise or censure.

In the language of the Georgia Journal, (the leading Whig paper in the State) and in language which will soon be general all over the country, we but desire to repeat, emphatically, that "if the country does not get a bank, it will not be the fault of the administration—but of others."

GENERAL HARRISON'S BANK OPINIONS.

Perhaps no man knew better—certainly no one was entitled to know better the opinions of the late President in relation to the extent of the Constitutional power of Congress to make a bank, than the eminent citizens who were his chosen cabinet advisers. Read Mr. WEBSTER'S letters on the first page, and then denounce President TYLER—if you can.

It may be well enough, also, in view of the possibility of a veto by President TYLER, that it should not be denounced (especially by Whigs) until it is seen whether or not it is exercised on either of the three great grounds to which

General HARRISON limited it, in his excellent letter to Judge Denny, written and published eight or ten months before his nomination at Harrisburg—as follows:

"In the exercise of the veto power, he [the President] should limit his rejection of bills to 1st, such as are in his opinion unconstitutional; 2d, such as tend to encroach on the rights of the States or individuals; 3d, such as, involving deep interests, may in his opinion require more mature deliberation, or reference to the will of the people, to be ascertained at the succeeding elections."

THE BANKRUPT BILL.

The subjoined extract from the remarks of Senator TALMADGE, on the occasion of presenting a memorial in favor of this great measure, to which he has so long and so ably and zealously devoted himself, conveys but a just rebuke to the Globe and its echoes, while placing the question above all mere party considerations. The objection, that some unworthy men may be availed of its provisions, applies equally to all other beneficent laws—and even to the dew of Heaven, which fall alike upon the just and the unjust—and is therefore no objection at all.

"Sir (said Mr. T.) in the article which I have read from the Globe we are told that the bankrupt law, at the last Presidential election, was worth 500,000 votes to the Federal party. I was not aware before that that party had derived any particular support on that occasion from the agitation of that question. Their leader was known to be opposed to it, whilst the candidate of the Democratic Republican party, to which I belong, was known to be in favor of it. This statement, therefore, judging from the uniform accuracy and verity of that paper, must be an 'error of the press.' I have no doubt that the Democratic Republican party, with Gen. Harrison at its head, did receive much support from a knowledge of his views in favor of a bankrupt law. The views of Gen. Harrison and Mr. Van Buren on this subject were well known to the whole country. They were together in the Senate of the United States, in 1827, when a bankrupt bill was under discussion. Gen. Harrison, on that occasion, took strong ground in favor, and Mr. Van Buren equally strong ground against it. Extracts from their speeches were extensively circulated during the last canvass, and it was well known that their respective friends in this Senate, with a few exceptions, when the bankrupt bill was under discussion in 1839 and 1840, ranged themselves for and against it, according to their political predilections. I have no doubt, therefore, that that question exercised an important influence in the late Presidential election. But it did not exercise then such an influence as it will exercise at elections hereafter. The other questions involved, together with the reluctance to separate from old political associates, prevented many of the other side from supporting Gen. Harrison, notwithstanding their anxiety for a bankrupt law. The discipline of party, too, restrained many from open and active exertion. That contest, with all its severity, is now passed. Since that eventful period, men breathe deeper and freer. They have resolved to think and act for themselves. They will no longer surrender their own rights at the dictation of a party leader. They have determined that the injunctions of the Constitution shall be obeyed—that a power which is exercised by every civilized nation, and which was conferred upon Congress for the sake of uniformity, shall no longer lie dormant. This determination is confined to no particular party—it pervades all parties. Every other consideration is secondary to this great question of emancipation from legal bondage. On this common, this neutral ground, men of all parties have taken their position, and sworn to stand shoulder to shoulder in all future contests, till victory shall perch on their standard."

CLAY, BRENT AND HARRISON.

Between Mr. Clay and Col. Brent, both of whom are distinguished members of the Whig party, we shall not adopt the slavish and disgusting course of the Louisville Journal and some other editors, who seem commissioned to hunt down, by the most reckless and persevering falsehoods, every man—no matter what his cause may be—who may temporarily disagree or dispute with the distinguished Kentuckian. While leaving, however, to the proper parties, the good or bad faith connected with the subject which constitutes the burden of the card of Col. B., the fame of the dead no less than justice to the living statesman, impels us to copy the following from the Cincinnati Republican—the editor of which, having enjoyed the confidence of General HARRISON, speaks doubtless what he knew. He says:

"As to the charge which Col. Brent makes with regard to Gen. HARRISON'S feelings towards Mr. CLAY, we have a word to say; and we utter that word because we happen to know something about the matter. Gen. HARRISON did feel on two occasions that Mr. CLAY had treated him unkindly, and had no explanations ensued, he would have died in that belief. But these explanations were made, and the result was a full and unqualified reconciliation—a reconciliation which made both parties feel and acknowledge that a simple misunderstanding was the cause, and the only cause, of a temporary estrangement. In proof of this we need only refer to the fact that Gen. HARRISON, both before and after the 4th of March, 1841, took occasion publicly and privately, to speak of the noble Kentuckian as the man among men who ought to have been President of the United States. So far, indeed, did his generous attachment carry him, that his friends in Cincinnati, feared at one time lest he might violate the pledge which he had given, that no man should know whom he preferred to succeed him!

No! no! the lamented HARRISON cherished the truest affection for HENRY CLAY, and if, for a moment, he thought he had been wronged by him, it was only to have the conviction still more strongly riveted upon his heart, that neither he, nor the country had a truer friend. And as we know, too, he was attached, warmly attached to Col. BRENT, and could he now speak, the word of censure, kindly, but firmly uttered, would be heard coming from his lips, rebuking him for the betrayal of his confidence, and the violence of his passion. The fame of

the dead is holy; but that of the living is equally sacred; and our single motive in saying what we have, is to rescue both from the taint even of a passing suspicion."

THE YEAS AND NAYS.

We find we have not capitals enough in our office to comply with our promise last week, and must therefore defer the votes of the two houses on several important propositions until a future number. Our readers shall have them, however—as we adhere to the determination that the quality of our matter, as well as its quantity, shall make the Times the cheapest and best paper in the State.

On the passage of the Fortification Bill.

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Allen, S. J. Andrews, Arnold, Ayer, Babcock, Baker, Barnard, Barton, Bidlack, Birdseye, Black, Blair, Boardman, Borden, Bots, Bowne, Brewster, Briggs, Brockway, Milton Brown, C. Brown, Burnell, William Butler, Wm. O. Butler, Calhoun, W. B. Campbell, T. J. Campbell, Caruthers, Childs, Chittenden, John C. Clark, S. N. Clark, Clifford, Clinton, Cowen, Cranston, Cravens, Cushing, G. Davis, William C. Dawson, Doig, John Edwards, Egbert, Everett, Ferris, Fessenden, Fillmore, Fornance, A. L. Foster, Comble, Gates, Gentry, Giddings, Gilmer, Goggin, P. G. Goode, Gordon, Greig, Gustine, Habersham, Hall, Halsted, W. S. Hastings, Hays, Henry, Holmes, Houck, Howard, Hudson, Ingersoll, J. Irvin, William W. Irwin, Jack, James, Isaac D. Jones, John P. Kennedy, King, Lane, Lawrence, Linn, Littlefield, Lowell, Robert McClellan, McKee, Mallory, T. F. Marshall, S. Mason, Mathiot, Mattocks, Maxwell, Maynard, Meriwether, Moore, Morgan, Morris, Morrow, Newhard, Nisbet, Osborne, Owley, Parmenter, Pearce, Pendleton, Pope, Powell, Proffit, Ramsey, Benjamin Randall, Alexander Randall, Randolph, Ridgway, Rodney, Roosevelt, Russell, Saltonstall, Sanford, Sergeant, Shields, Simonton, Slade, Smith, Snyder, Stanley, Stokely, Stratton, Stuart, Talfierro, J. B. Thompson, Richard, W. Thompson, Tillinghast, Toland, Tomlinson, Trumbull, Underwood, Van Buren, Van Rensselaer, Wallace, Ward, Warren, Westbrook, Edward D. White, T. W. Williams, C. H. Williams, Winthrop, Yorke, A. Young, John Young—148.

NAYS—Messrs. L. W. Andrews, Arrington, Atherton, Beeson, Boyd, Bronson, A. V. Brown, Burke, Sampson H. Butler, G. W. Caldwell, Patrick C. Caldwell, J. Campbell, Cary, Chapman, Coles, Daniel, R. D. Davis, Dean, Deberry, Doan, Eastman, J. C. Edwards, J. F. Floyd, Gerry, W. O. Goode, Graham, Green, Harris, J. Hastings, Hopkins, Houston, Hubard, Hunter, Cave Johnson, John W. Jones, Keim, Lewis, Abraham McClellan, McKay, Marchand, T. J. Mason, Miller, Oliver, Patridge, Payne, Pickens, Plumer, Reding, Rencher, Rhett, Riggs, Saunders, Shaw, Shepperd, Steenrod, Sumpter, Sweeney, Turney, Watterson, Weller, J. L. White, J. W. Williams, Lewis Williams, J. L. Williams, Wise—66.

On the Revenue Bill.

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Allen, L. W. Andrews, S. J. Andrews, Arnold, Ayer, Babcock, Baker, Barnard, Barton, Birdseye, Black, Blair, Boardman, Borden, Bots, Bowne, Brewster, Briggs, Brockway, Bronson, M. Brown, J. Brown, Burnell, Wm. Butler, W. B. Campbell, Thomas J. Campbell, Caruthers, Childs, Chittenden, J. C. Clark, Cowen, Cranston, Cravens, Cushing, G. Davis, Wm. C. Dawson, Deberry, Fessenden, Fillmore, A. L. Foster, Gamble, Gates, Gentry, Giddings, Goggin, P. G. Goode, Graham, Green, Greig, Habersham, Hall, Halsted, W. S. Hastings, Henry, Howard, Hudson, James, Isaac D. Jones, John P. Kennedy, King, Lane, Lawrence, Linn, T. F. Marshall, Samuel Mason, Mathiot, Mattocks, Maxwell, Maynard, Meriwether, Moore, Morgan, Morris, Morrow, Nisbet, Osborne, Owley, Parmenter, Pearce, Pendleton, Pope, Powell, Proffit, Ramsey, Benjamin Randall, Alexander Randall, Randolph, Rencher, Ridgway, Rodney, Russell, Sergeant, Shepard, Simonton, Smith, Solters, Sprigg, Stanley, Stokely, Stratton, Stuart, Summers, Talfierro, R. W. Thompson, Tillinghast, Toland, Tomlinson, Triplett, Trumbull, Underwood, Warren, Washington, E. D. White, J. L. White, T. W. Williams, Lewis Williams, C. H. Williams, J. L. Williams, Yorke, A. Young, John Young—110.

NAYS—Messrs. Alford, Arrington, Atherton, Banks, Beeson, Bidlack, Borden, Bowne, Boyd, Brewster, A. V. Brown, C. Brown, Burke, Sampson, H. Butler, Wm. O. Butler, Green, W. Brown, Patrick C. Caldwell, J. Campbell, Cary, Chapman, Clifford, Clinton, Cross, Daniel, R. D. Davis, J. B. Dawson, Dean, Dimock, Doan, Doig, John Edwards, John C. Edwards, Everett, Ferris, J. F. Floyd, Chas. A. Floyd, Fornance, Gerry, Gilmer, William O. Goode, Gordon, Gustine, J. Hastings, Hays, Hopkins, Houston, Hunter, Cave Johnson, J. W. Jones, A. Kennedy, Lewis, Littlefield, Lowell, W. A. Jones, McClellan, R. McClellan, McKay, McKee, Miller, Marchand, Alfred Marshall, Mattocks, Maxwell, Newhard, Oliver, Parmenter, Patridge, Payne, Pickens, Plumer, Reding, Riggs, Rogers, Roosevelt, Saltonstall, Stanford, Saunders, Shaw, Shields, Slade, Snyder, Steenrod, Sumpter, Sweeney, John B. Thompson, Turney, Van Buren, Van Rensselaer, Wallace, Ward, Watterson, Weller, Westbrook, J. W. Williams, Winthrop, Wise—101.

To include State Banks in the Bankrupt bill.

YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Bates, Bayard, Benton, Buchanan, Linn, McRoberts, Nicholson, Pierce, Smith, of Connecticut, Surgeon, Tappan, Walker, Williams, Woodbury, Wright—16.

NAYS—Messrs. Archer, Barrow, Berrien, Calhoun, Choate, Clay, of Alabama, Clay, of Kentucky, Clayton, Cuthbert, Dixon, Evans, Fulton, Graham, Henderson, Huntington, Kerr, King, Mangum, Merrick, Miller, Morehead, Mouton, Phelps, Porter, Prentiss, Preston, Rives, Sevier, Simmons, Smith, of Indiana, Southard, Tallmadge, White, Woodbridge—34.

On the passage of the Bankrupt bill.

YEAS—Messrs. Barrow, Bates, Berrien, Choate, Clay of Kentucky, Clayton, Dixon, Evans, Henderson, Huntington, Kerr, Merrick, Miller, Morehead, Mouton, Phelps, Porter, Simmons, Smith, of Indiana, Southard, Tallmadge, Walker, Williams, White, Woodbridge, and Young—20.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Archer, Bayard, Benton, Buchanan, Calhoun, Clay of Alabama, Cuthbert, Fulton, Graham, King, Linn, McRoberts, Nicholson, Pierce, Prentiss, Rives, Sevier, Smith of Connecticut, Surgeon, Tappan, Woodbury, and Wright—23.

THE JUDICIARY.—Judge SCOTT, of the 9th circuit, has been promoted to the vacancy on the Supreme bench, and Col. MORROW, of this town, takes the place vacated by Judge SCOTT. We have known "how the land lay" ever since Judge HUNT was put to bed with the sore eyes, in the Jeffersonian and Democrat—but "kept dark." As to the appointments themselves—the Governor might have done worse.